ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 7/20/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC ACCESSION NO.	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
ED001636	N.A.	00816 c.2

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S):
Lippitt, Ronald

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
The Youth Culture, the School System and the Socialization Community

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
N.A.

7. EDITOR(S):
N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Ronald Lippitt, Institute for Social Research
ST. University of Michigan
CITY, STATE East Lansing, Michigan

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, Welfare Adm., U.S. Dept. of HEW Wash., D.C.

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	10/64	17

TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

community attitudes	parent training	youth culture	sociological factors	
community responsibility	research, diagnostic	peer groups	environmental factors	
community agencies	community leaders	communication		

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

The "socialization community" was defined as the program for rearing, educating, and assimilating the young into a community. Professional leaders and program directors from a variety of community agent cities, representative of the "socialization community," were interviewed.

A lack of communication or coordination was found existent among socialization agents, in the communities studied, (Flint, Michigan and Chicago, Illinois), at the level of direct work with the young. Poor communication existed between colleagues in schools and among community program directors.

Parents were cited as the major cause of student misbehavior; yet, little was done to increase parental involvement in student programs. Students were presented with sequences of educational experiences, which tended to alienate them from both the teacher and the school. Students' judgments of other students tended to increase such alienation.

Seminars and laboratories for youth program leaders in the two communities were conducted. A teaching clinic in which new techniques were used relevant to the kindergarten level was organized. Family discussion sessions were organized.

It was concluded that "diagnostic research of action research" was the most efficient way to arrive at valid educational innovations.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OR PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

0816
.2
p file 1 Environmental Implications

DVC.

ED001636

Reproduced and Distributed in the interest of
improved services to children and youth by:

TRAINING CENTER IN YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

Law-Medicine Institute, Boston University

October, 1964

The Youth Culture, the School System and the Socialization Community

Ronald Lippitt
Institute for Social Research
The University of Michigan

Grant Support by
Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development

Welfare Administration

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Washington, D.C. 20201

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Please Return To:

CLEARINGHOUSE
CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
ON EDUCATIONAL DIFFER...

The Youth Culture, the School System and the Socialization of Community

Ronald Lippitt
Institute for Social Research
The University of Michigan

The paper is divided into two sections. The first is a diagnostic section, attempting to provide a brief diagnostic summary of community functioning as youth development agencies and environments. The second section is action-oriented, giving a summary of several courses of youth development action with b[illegible]tions.

I. Diagnostic Observations

My conclusions and illustrations draw heavily from our community programs of youth development action-research in Chicago and Flint, from our research relations with about a dozen elementary and secondary school buildings, and also from some of the diagnostic and action research of other investigators such as Reiss, Miller, Gross, Ohlin, Cohen and others.

First, viewing the community as a socialization community, one can describe and assess a community in terms of various dimensions. One can think of it in terms of its political functioning, or its economic stability, or its physical plan and structure, I want to think of it in terms of its socialization design, its program for rearing, educating, assimilating the young. It is this area of activity which I refer to in using the term, "socialization community."

A. The Socialization Community: Diagnostic Observations.

In a study of a city of 200,000 we found that we could differentiate 7 different community socialization functions carried on by professional socialization agencies and agents: (1) The formal education function; (2) The religious development function; (3) The leisure time and recreation function; (4) Therapeutic and re-education services; (5) Economic role-socialization; (6) Political role-socialization; and (7) Social control or legal code-socialization.

Starting with half a dozen central community leaders, we found that they could nominate a number of persons in each of these areas (except one that I'll mention). By going to each of the nominees, and asking them to nominate the most influential leaders in their area of socialization activity, we were able to identify about 70 key figures, who, by a rank ordering procedure among informants, were the influential leaders in six of these areas of child and youth development. The one area which proved a vacuum was that of integrating the young into the political system of the community. There was also considerable disagreement on who

were the key leaders in economic system socialization because those training for occupational roles, and those hiring youth, and those placing them did not perceive and nominate each other with any consistancy.

We interviewed these panels of nominated leaders of the socialization community to get their conceptions of the socialization job; their conceptions of deviancy, and of its causes; their amount of communication, and coordination of effort between themselves. I want to select out a few findings from these two or three hour interviews.

First, there was quite a bit more communication between, and perception of common goals by the leaders within the same socialization function as compared to across functions.

There was quite a bit of disagreement as to what was the most serious type of deviant development of the young ones in the community. The interviewer asked them to regard the community as a producer of young people. What were good products, and what were poor productions coming off the assembly line of the community? The educators, the religious and leisure time leaders stressed deviancy of social relations and lack of respect for adults. The economic integration leaders stressed laziness, lack of work incentive, disrespect for property. Therapeutic workers and legal control officials stressed a lack of values and immaturity about impulse control.

When the socialization leaders were probed as to the causes of undesirable as well as desirable behavior, half the educators gave the family top credit for good outcomes; a third gave the school top influence; others mentioned the church and the community.

When queried about the causes of bad behavior, three quarters of the educators blamed the parents, and the next most frequent mention was the larger society, outside of the community. There was no mention of school, church, or community as responsible for any bad effects.

This same pattern for other leadership segments was true, although no other segments viewed the school as such a potent cause of good behavior. Other segments gave the community more credit for positive influence than did the educators.

The economic leaders placed more blame on the family. Ninety-two percent of economic leaders gave the family as the major cause of deviant behavior.

The religious and leisure time workers were only ones to see peers, other young ones, as a significant cause of deviancy.

The economic socialization agents were in major disagreement with the other segments in believing that the problem of deviant behavior could be solved by more discipline.

The religious and leisure time leaders felt that the major correcitve action to be taken is by the family.

The therapeutic agents saw individual counseling and guidance functions as the most needed.

The educators express a broader perspective of need for individual counseling, involvement in new group activities, and action on changing the attitudes and organization of the community to deal more effectively with the young.

On the question of who should take the responsibility for rehabilitative effort, a majority of the educational leaders, 63% say they and others in the community have equal responsibility.

Three quarters of the economic and religious leaders say it's primarily a job for someone else, mostly parents.

Therapeutic and corrective agencies see a major role for themselves, and do not see the school as highly relevant for rehabilitative work.

In a reciprocal way the school leaders do not see the law enforcement and therapeutic agencies as significantly important influences for change in youth development.

Without pursuing the data further at this point, let me summarize what seems to me to be several of the highlights about the functioning of the professional socialization community:

First, there is a widespread agreement in the major attribution of blame to parents as a causal factor. But there is little mention of goals or significant programs for the involvement of parents or collaboration with parents in the strergthening of family leadership There are significant differences in ideas about what ought to be done and by whom, and a significant lack of coordination dialogue between the leaders across segments (in terms of reported frequency of conversation and about what).

Now I would like to go to a second level of functioning of the socialization community. We've been talking about the top influentials. They are the policy and program leaders. The real day to day interaction process of socializing the young is of course being carried on by a large network of direct workers: teachers, counselors, big brothers, club leaders, scoutmasters, recreational

leaders and so on. What kind of team work is there here?

The answer is that there is far less communication than among the program leaders. We secured nominations of some 200 direct workers who were viewed by program leaders as the most creative and visible group of individual workers with the young in all segments of the community. When a sample of them was invited to meet, we found them quite ignorant of each other's practices or of each other's clients. There was no process of exchange of information across programs.

In a more intensive study of some 10 elementary and secondary buildings, we have also found that colleagues in the same building do not share their classroom practice inventions from classroom to classroom.

So again we can summarize our diagnosis that at the level of direct work with the young, there is a lack of communication or coordinati among socialization agents, and again a general exclusion of parents and lack of connection with family life. Those who are seen to be most influential, and also the most amateur, are the most neglected and isolated members of the child and youth development team.

Before leaving this diagnosis of the socialization community, let me point to another problem which I think is just as serious as that of communication and coordination. This is the problem of personnel recruitment and training.

As the National Commission on National Health has pointed out, the most serious need we have for social and educational service in every community is the need for the effective recruiting and training of volunteer and sub-professional manpower. To be effective this must be a cooperative task for the various socialization agencies, and a continuous and high priority must be given to high quality programs of in-service training. These can only be sustained by cooperative inter-agency training programs.

I have recently had a number of conversations with school board members who are from industry about this data. They usually express surprise, and dismay at the typical lack of well developed in-service education programs with highly qualified training officers in school systems, and in other child and youth developmen agencies of the community. As one of them put it recently: "how is it that we can keep our agricultural practitioners, the farmers, linked so closely with new research and practice, but have so little going on to link educational practitioners with new research and new developments in raising children? We seem to value our efficiency in raising hogs, and creating new machines more than our

efficiency in raising kids." We'll return to this problem later when we look at some of the concrete potentialities for improvement of youth development practice.

It is time now to turn from the community perspective to a consideration of our clients, the children and youth whom we are trying to help grow up and who seem so often to deviate from our plans for their education and their maturation.

B. The Youth Culture: Diagnostic Observations. Now viewing the young ones as a peer society with a variety of subcultures and collective standards, there is a temptation and a tendency for teachers and other youth workers to view the classroom group or the club situation as one where they as adult leaders have the major influence over the learning or behavior of each child in the group. They see the situation as one of a relationship between themselves and each of the learners, pupils, students, group members But research analyses reveal that they are dealing with a complex social structure of peers where motivation to learn and patterns of relationship towards adults, are highly determined by the group standards, and the inter-personal evaluations among the child members.

Sociometric studies in junior high and senior high groups have shown that the anti-school and the pro-school students tend to form separate group societies with a good deal of mutual antagonism and avoidance. Race and social class also influence the formation of sub-structures in the school.

A number of studies show that the student's position in the peer group remains quite stable from fall to spring, and from year to year; the correlations, for example, from October till June in status position within the classroom range from 70 to 95.

What difference does all of this make in regards to educational objectives? Some of the major findings from both elementary and secondary classroom studies indicate that classmates who are dislikes compared to classmates who are likes, when matched for I.Q., are found to under-utilize their intellectual capacity. Being disliked is especially dysfunctional for girls.

Classmates who are evaluated as low in influence status are also under-utilizers, and being low in influence status is especially dysfunctional for boys. The rejected, low status peers evaluate themselves and their school work and the teacher more negatively than their higher status peers of equal-intellectual ability.

In the same school and classroom climates, there is often one path to status open to the low status child. He can demonstrate boldness in resisting and testing adult authority. If there is a

general feeling in the group that the adult leadership is noxious in some way, then peer status can be achieved in this way.

Let us turn now to a different aspect of the classroom or group situation, the cross-generational relations between the adults and the young ones. In one study of all elementary classrooms in one school we took a series of quantitative classroom observations of teacher-pupil interaction. This was in a highly rated school with a well trained professional staff. One of the major findings was that the children who were low status with their peers were also most frequently criticised and least frequently rewarded by their teachers. Particularly rejected were the acting-out, low achievement boys. The teachers were not aware of this pattern.

In short, the teachers were in unconscious collusion with the peers in providing a failure and exclusion experience for this particular sub-population of classroom members.

Wormell's study of under-achievement in junior high school indicates that communication and support from parents is much less active and positive for under-achievers as compared to high achievers with the same intellectual ability.

Schmuck and Van Egmond have confirmed this finding in larger studies of populations of elementary and secondary classrooms.

The negative student's attitudes of rejection and avoidance of the adults and adult helping efforts are supported usually by a small reference group of like minded peers within the classroom group. The teacher's self defeating efforts to exert more control on these pupils are also supported, both by her own impulses and her perceptions of the expectations of prestigeful colleagues in the building.

Now I would like to view the school system learning situation in a third way: as a cross-age peer culture of relationships between children of different ages.

Most children have grown up in a cross-age peer culture of brothers and sisters, and of neighborhood associates. From the older ones they have been able to learn by observation many of the tricks of the trade of how to behave towards and cope with grown ups. They have also experienced the patterns of teasing, exploitation, and ignoring behavior from the older ones. Their desires to look up to and emulate are mixed with needs to defend themselves and even to retaliate when it is safe. The significant influence of olders as anti-social models is well known in the work on delinquency. The use of olders as educational

helpers and socializers was a customary pattern in the rural school. Very little systematic research on the role of cross-age relationships in the school system has been undertaken. We are just beginning some experimentation which I will refer to in a moment. But let me express a belief at this point that cross-age peer relations are one of the very potent forces in the school system at all age levels -- forces either towards rejection of learning or towards the acceptance of learning.

One very important restraint on active cooperation with the teacher in learning activities by the young has been revealed in a study of pupil perceptions of the values and expectations of their classmates. Frequently a majority of the students in a classroom perceive that a majority of the others are against too much commitment to school work; too much recitation, too much cooperation with the teacher. While actually on private questionaires a majority in the class say that personally they would like to be more active in learning and have more relationship with the teacher.

This inhibiting state of pluralistic ignorance, as it is called by the sociologists, continues as long as there is no occasion to share and discuss their personal values. An even more disturbing restraint to creative cross-generational relations in the classroom has been revealed in some interviews with teachers who have entered new teaching assignments with enthusiastic plans for sharing the planning and execution of the educational adventure with their students, but very soon feel the disapproval of their older higher status colleagues that such nonsense may give the students wrong ideas.

Students confirm that very often a new teacher is "swell" for a couple of years until she gets "spoiled". "Fear of what my colleagues would think" frequently comes up as a strong restraining force and it seems to inhibit more active efforts at educational collaboration with the young ones.

To summarize, then, these brief observations; I believe it possible to say that negative alienative relations between many teachers and students develop and continue because both students and teachers from their past experience are mutually oriented towards a distrust relationship which they test and confirm in their early contact with each other.

Second, there is often a history of failure at academic tasks which has prejudiced many of the young ones against committing effort and motivation towards another probable failure experience. So that the well motivated and often well designed help efforts of good teachers are rejected as a defense against another failure experience.

Third, and finally I would like to view the school system as a system of organized team work among professional educators.

C. The School System: Diagnostic Observations. I shan't try to summarize the diagnostic research on the school system as an organization. Albert Reiss, Neal Gross, and other students of school organization are better equipped than I. But I would like to offer three interpretations from our research activities.

First, as I see it, the pupils or students in most school systems are in a relationship to the school system which is quite parallel to that of first line employees in many business and government organizations. The participation and involvement in planning and decision making stops at the level just above them.

The situation is changing rapidly in business organizations as the result of the research and analyses of Argyris, MacGregor, Hare, Likert, Kahn, Mann and others. Many managers now see the most important and productive pattern of relationships as one of "participative management" where overlapping committees, task groups or working groups link all levels of the organization in diagnosis of problems, in the projection of plans and in commitments to action.

Students in school do not have this type of involvement in and commitment to the goals, to the designing, and to the execution of their learning experiences.

Second, there is a remarkable collusion of non-communication among teaching colleagues about their classroom practices, about their educational goals of philosophy, and about their efforts to help particular students.

Third, teachers tend to perceive their administrators as negatively evaluating various kinds of educational innovations which would experiment with curriculum organization, with teaching practices and with more active involvement of students in evaluating and influencing the functioning of the educational system.

D. Summary of Diagnostic Observations. For summary then of these diagnostic observations, let me try to reorganize the observations to formulate a summary that will link more directly with some examples of directions of effort.

First, at the level of community system or socialization community, there seems to be a lack of communication and coordination of youth development program planning leaders and also direct workers, and a lack of joint effort in the location,

recruiting and training of the needed manpower. There are a variety of significant unresolved differences here between leadership segments as to what ought to be done and by whom.

Second, at the community level, there is much attribution of parents as a major cause of misbehavior, but relatively little in the way of significant effort at the involvement and in-service training of parents.

At the level of the school system, in summary, there is a lack of involvement of the young learners in the goals and functions of the school system. There are conflicts between the efficiency values of the educational administrators (our experiences were primarily with principals and single buildings), and our knowledge of educational effectiveness, particularly for the effective education of deviant and alienated learners.

Third, there is a lack of shared commitment and communication between colleagues in the development and improvement of educational practice.

Finally, pupils are permitted to have sequences of educational experience in the school that produce and nurture increasingly serious alienation from the teacher, from school and from learning tasks, and may become a separated sub-population within the peer culture.

At the youth cultural level, in summary, there is typically a peer inter-personal evaluation process that frequently creates an unhealthy mental health situation as well as low learning motivation situation for a significant number of students. I am refering to middle-class classrooms in suburbs as well as lower-class classrooms in the central city. Sometimes segregated sub-cultures develop along lines of social class or race. In other cases the separation is between a pro-social, pro-learning population and those that have an anti-social behavior orientation. There are various other dimensions on which peer group evaluations divide the child and youth culture.

Second, the inter-personal status process in the peer group provokes and encourages some students to find needed attention and recognition through anti-teacher and anti-learning leadership efforts.

Finally, a potent cross-age peer influence process exists which is neglected as a major educational force.

II. Illustrative Designs for Action.

Now to look at some brief illustrations of action designs related to some of these diagnostic points. Our team of social scientists have used data from the type of studies I've summarized here as a stimulus to derive action designs in collaboration with educators and other youth workers, to attempt to formulate some of the alternative approaches that might best cope with the particular problem.

This social engineering task should utilize our scientific knowledge to formulate some effective revisions of educational practice. Let me give you some snap shots of what has emerged. I want to make one footnote, however, and that is that one of the healthy experiences for all of our young social scientist-engineers has been to find in almost every school building teachers who have developed creative practices which were unaware of the significance of their inventions, were not able to articulate them, and certainly were not able to or motivated to communicate them to others.

As a result we have a great wealth of innovative practices which are being lost by lack of description, documentation, evaluation, articulate conceptualization and diffusion to peers. But many new images of practice also emerge as the scientists and practitioners use the very exciting opportunity to collaborate.

A. Working with the Socialization Community. First, at the level of the socialization community. One activity was an invitation seminar for selected program leaders from all of the six socialization segments which I have mentioned earlier. Thirty were selected as the key figures in the six segments. Twenty-seven responded positively by coming and staying with it.

The seminar started with a feed-back phase of looking at the research data, then moved into discussion and planning. When I say feed-back of research perhaps the image that comes to mind is one of presentation of charts and graphs. But we have found this was not as effective as a starting point. Most of the data in early feed-back sessions were presented by a series of dramatic episodes of inter-action which were selected to represent the data. The community leaders are able to look at these events, think about them in terms of the relevance to what they have experienced. The researcher can say to what degree this kind of behavioral episode is typical of the relationship, for example, between delinquent boys and their fathers.

They then moved from this review of knowledge to the activity of defining issues through active discussion between judge, the school administrator, Council of Social Agencies Administrator

and so forth. This became a very significant process as they began to listen to each other. Then the third phase was one of developing into problem-work groups, setting up task forces which moved ahead with consultation from one of the university team. The four work groups which developed out of the seminar were: (1) one on designs for rehabilitation of delinquents; (2) one around delinqency prevention; (3) a third on values education; and (4) one around coordination of services in relation to the family.

A second community level experiment was the nomination process and then invitation of about 35 workers across the community agencies to become members of a community youth leader's seminar. This again started with a feed-back process, developed into a concern with criteria for good practice, and then developed into an exchange process for exchanging innovations. They are now in the process of developing an innovation booklet which they can use across all agencies (including the school) to describe their practices. The main [counculting] help was on how to articulate, how to describe, how to conceptualize meaningful practice.

A third activity has been the development at the state level of the Michigan Laboratory for Workers with Youth. This involves about 20 of the youth serving agencies of the State including the State Department of Instruction and the Michigan Education Association, with co-sponsorship by Michigan State University, Wayne State University and the University of Michigan. There have been three laboratories in which the exciting thing to me has been that the educators have reported that one of the most significant learning experiences for them has been the dialogue with professional agency leaders outside of the school system.

A fourth activity, in some ways the most difficult, has been the job of identifying those who are the trainers of youth workers in the community. Who are the trainers of volunteers, sub-professionals, the in-service trainers of teachers, of boy scout leaders, of mental health workers, of parents, and so on. We are now looking at the possibility of future programs of in-service training which will cut across all community socialization agencies.

B. Working with the School System. Moving down to the level of the school system let me mention several directions of effort that have derived from our diagnostic work. There was a very active response of teachers in several school systems when given opportunity to engage in diagnostic research about what was going on in their classrooms that effected motivation to learn and mental health conditions for the learners.

There was a brief presentation of the opportunity to collaborate at faculty meetings, followed by a chance for any teacher to

leave a slip indicating that he was interested in talking further about this opportunity after school someday. We had lots of volunteers and had a job of selecting from a much larger population of volunteers than we were able to cope with. This was at elementary, junior high and senior high levels.

The cooperating teachers began with data collection in their classrooms, including some instruments in which they were attempting to formulate their own approach to teaching, their own philosophy of education, as well as receiving data from the pupils. This was followed by a workshop period in which the teachers were helped to interpret their data and, in collaboration with a consultant, to work on decisions and plans for producing changes in practice that seems to be relevant as derivations from the data about their classrooms and themselves.

One interesting innovation developed when the teachers faced the fact of doing something significantly different in their own classrooms which they felt was dangerous. There were all kinds of images of awkwardness and difficulty. So a squad of children was recruited to come in and help them to give them a chance to practice new approaches. This team of 11 and 12-year-old pupils developed a great enthusiasm for this role as teacher trainers. When the teachers wanted to try out some kind of technique at a pre-"playing for keeps" level, and get feedback, the pupils were available for tryout and evaluation.

Another significant fact that emerged was that one or two teachers from a particular school building felt a strong need for support at the time that they were beginning to try out a new approach, but they didn't feel that they could find that support within their own school building. So they developed a cross-building clinic in which they met every three weeks all winter. Some of them driving 60 or 70 miles but never missing this chance to share problems, to talk about failure freely, and to ask help from each other. This was one of the most significant eye openers for us as to the problems of shared in-service training experience within the building.

Another action-design grew out of the interest in spreading significant new practices. The idea developed of forming "diffusion teams" to see to what extent new practices developed by these teachers could be spread to others. There were some 30 or 40 practices. The teachers helped develop a little brochure called, "Inventory of Teaching Innovations Directed Toward Improving Classroom Learning Atmospheres". Three person "diffusion teams" of the principal, a collaborating teacher and an outside consultant were developed for each building to see what could be done to link from the year of experimentation to the interests of the other teachers in the building.

One of the interesting things that showed up was that the teachers, by and large, had the notion that to use somebody's practice was "imitation" and looked down upon. For prospective we looked at what happens in the medical field or industry or agriculture in the search for innovation and noted the great value placed on adoption and creative adaptation. By and large this was a tremendous eye opening experience for the teachers who were seeing the notion of imitating somebody else in the building as low status.

Another activity-design that has developed is the idea of cross-generational training; that is, direct training of the young ones and the adults together. We have tried this three times with family units and are planning to try some teacher pupil units. The interesting discovery with family units has been that there needs to be a phase when the mothers, the fathers and the teenagers are meeting separately to talk about their problems of communication Then there comes a phase when it is possible for them to look at family life episodes (produced by role playing) while they are sitting and observing in family like units, but where nobody is sitting with anybody from his own family. A mother, father, a daughter or a son will be sitting in a diagnostic family team, but nobody from the same family is in the same trio. They observe typical family episodes that have come up as crucial in their previous discussion. After a number of sessions of this kind they can begin to sit in family units and have open communication in diagnosis of these family events that are like their own. Then they are ready to begin discussing their own relations in family sessions. We believe that a significant approach to teacher-student relations will also be possible with this type of design.

C. Working with the Youth Culture. Let me move to just two or three examples of experimentation at the peer system level. A first design focuses on the involvement of the student group in the goals and evaluation of learning activity.

In a fifth grade, bi-racial and mixed social class the teacher's disgnosis described that three of the five top status members of the class group were among the most anti-learning, anti-teacher members of the classroom peer structure.

The teacher started with the appointment, from her sociometric data, of a classroom steering committee which included two anti-social leaders and two pro-social leaders. She convened them for a bag lunch which she provided the first time. She presented the notion that -shouldn't it be worthwhile to find out what the whole classroom thought were signs that they were having a good

day in the classroom, and a bad day. She worked with them on leading this discussion.

They presented the question to the class: if a visitor were coming into their class from Russia and didn't know anything about American classrooms, what would be signs that we were not having a very good day of learning things and feeling happy in our classroom, and what would be signs that we were having a good day. They made two lists on the board and each day of the week one of the steering committee was an evaluation research person who kept a check list of events, and at the end of the day he had the last half hour to review what he thought had been the signs of a good day and a bad day. He noticed and voiced whatever recommendations had come up in his mind about what they might try tomorrow to improve their day.

At the end of the week, the steering committee had the last hour to discuss the whole week, and to lead discussion on reactions to their observations and recommendations. At the end of two weeks, they appointed the next steering committee which appointed the next one, etc.

One of the interesting evidences of movement in the social structure was that in the fifth week the boy who had been second in power, and the most anti-social, came to the teacher and said he felt that the kids weren't listening to him so much or paying attention to him, what should he do? He had gone down, in fact, to 12th position in socio-metric structure and was interested finally in getting help. This began the process of significant teacher relationship to several of these pupils.

Another rather interesting process began when some of the teachers developed courage to get data from the pupils about how they felt about various aspects of their teaching. The process which turned out to be the most effective was one where on a number of scales the children rated where they saw the teacher and drew lines to where they wished she were. At the same time the teacher rates the classroom where she sees it on a series of dimensions, and where she wishes it were. They put these up on the board as data to look at in terms of reciprocal analysis of their wishes for each other.

Another very exciting adventure has been one in which, at a community wide level, nominations were secured of teen-age leaders; negro, white, lower class, middle class, anti-social, pro-social. They were invited to become a community teen leadership seminar. They began again by looking at data from the studies of the causes of problems between adults and young people in the community. They went from that to facing the question of what kinds of unhealthy divisions they had within the peer society. The tapes of these meetings report, for example, a discussion of a middle

class boy talking about the feelings he had when walking down the high school corridor with a negro friend and seeing one of his buddies coming and wondering how he will react, and wishing he didn't feel that way, but he does. Discussions of this sort led them to have a week-end retreat on relations among teen-agers, out of which came two committees. A committee to train parents and teachers and a committee to write a pamphlet of teen-age feelings about relations with adults. They have had a series of sessions on an invitation basis with parents and teachers. The response of the adults to this invitation is very encouraging.

Just one example from the area of cross-age peer relations. In a lower class, bi-racial school, and also in a middle class laboratory school we decided to test the notion that perhaps some of the most helpful influences on motivation to learn and actually on skill learning in the first, second and third grades might come from assistance by sixth graders. We had some research on how these ages perceived each other. We recognized that there were some problems, for example, of punitive and teasing orientations of olders towards youngers. Before any of the eager volunteers from the sixth grade, who had a chance to volunteer to be assistants in the first, second and third grades, were permitted to begin their work, a seminar began on "olders helping youngers". It was a twice a week event at lunch time, or just after lunch, for half an hour. It continued during all of the time of their field work. So that they would bring in from their field work with the first grader they were assigned to and working with issues they were having in helping on reading, arithmetic, etc. They did a great deal of role-playing of their problems of tutoring.

Let me give you a brief example of cross-age help. This is a kindergarten example where one of the acting out, agressive boys was having a temper tantrum and knocked down some material other children were working with. He was sent over to the corner and the teacher went over and asked him if there was anything she could do to help him think about this. He said, "please send for Jim." Jim was the most acting-out sixth grade boy in the team of sixth grade helpers. Jim came down from his room for a few minutes. The situation was explained to him. He went over and talked to the boy for a few minutes. The boy got up and rejoined his classmates. He had been told that when he felt that he could join the group again, it was OK. He went back and began playing quietly. As Jim was leaving the teacher asked how he had helped. He said, "Well, I just told him that this is the way I used to behave all of the time and I still do too much, and you sure miss out on a lot of fun that way, and the other kids won't like you".

Of course, the teacher could have said the same things, but it couldn't have the same effect.

The exuberance of developing this kind of helping skill and sensitivity on the part of these youngsters is coupled with reports from the sixth grade teacher that the helpers showed quite an upward spurt in their own academic motivation as a result of this kind of responisbility as helpers and models.

There are many creative practitioners, of course, who have come up with inventions similar to and superior to these. The major point I think is that it is possible to produce, in collaboration with practitioners, scientific data that will provide an efficient base for innovations and evaluation of them. And if the collaboration can include an emphasis on documentation then the important linkage of diffusion to others can occur.

D. Summary of Observations About Research Utilization. In conclusion, it seems to me that much of the waste could be cut out of educational experimentation, out of new product development as the industrialists think of it, if diagnostic research of action research were recognized as a most efficient way to arrive at validated educational innovations and the diffusion of them.

Second, the diffusion of new creative practices is a much more serious problem than that of invention. This is an area of greatest waste at the moment in such fields as delinquency prevention, work with the dropout, the retarded, etc.

The research knowledge and the conceptual perspective needed to design sound programs will usually not be found in the staff of operating agencies. Locating outsiders,often University based collaborators, is one of the best bets for efficient and active product development. The same holds true, I think, for locating the best manpower resources for in-service training of the staff. In several fields the techniques of in-service training have developed far beyond current training practices in education, both in-service and pre-service training. We need to utilize these resources just as we need to utilize scientific resources.

Finally by taking initiative and stimulating the cooperation with other agencies, and in demonstrating innovative programs, I think the school has the most central opportunity to exert key leadership in the socialization of the community.